

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/716,431	11/20/2003	Makoto Sasaki	117835	6965	
25944 OLIFF & BER	7590 07/11/200 PRIDGE PLC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 320	850		DALEY, CLIFTON G		
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/716,431		SASAKI, MAKOTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLIFTON G. DALEY	2624	

	CLIFTON G. DALEY	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	lress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Openiods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	te extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex- under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s- set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee to action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externous Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I 			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 4-11, 14-20, 23 and 24</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	tice of Anneal will no	t he entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Samir A. Ahmed/	O-min About d						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624	Samir Ahmed Examiner						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Art Unit: 2624

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 102 rejection of claims 25 and 27 rendered moot by cancellation of claims 25 and 27.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's remarks have been considered and are not persuasive. Lundaht's weighted distance calculation clearly quantifies "degree of accuracy", which is used to determine if a value is normal or abnormal. Regarding applicant's assertion that w(s) is not a function of the weighted distance, Lundahl teaches that w(s) is a smooth monotonically decreasing function of distance (eg. equation 19). Regarding motivation to combine. Applicant asserts that Lundahl's teaching is targeted towards optimizing consumer profiles. However, Lundahl discloses consumer profiles as an example application. Lundahl's teachings are generally directed to the dynamic analysis of data (page 1, paragraph [0002]), and are therefore appropriate for combination with any teaching comprising data analysis.